

Serial No. **10/720,385**

Docket No. **K-0196A**

Amendment dated **PROPOSED**

Reply to Office Action of **June 29, 2004**

REMARKS

Claims 22-94 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 22, 23, 25-27, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 38, 40-42, 45, 46, 48, 54, 55, 57, 58, 63-68, 71 and 72 are amended, claims 28, 36, 44, 52, 61, and 69 are canceled, and claims 73-94 are added.

The undersigned thank Examiners Hodges and Williams for the interview on November 3, 2004.

Claim 35 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Claim 35 has been amended to obviate this objection, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23, 26, 33, 41, 49, 53, 58, 62, 67, and 70 stand objected to based on informalities, e.g., improper dependency. The informalities have been corrected, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-24, 27-31, 34-39 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Nagano (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,329). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed, independent claims 22, 29 and 37 have been further amended to structurally distinguish over the Figure 9 embodiment of Nagano. For example, Nagano fails to disclose or teach a plurality of second sustain electrodes spaced apart from the first sustain electrodes and the plurality of first and second sustain electrodes providing a plurality of gaps. Further, a gap provided by the first and second sustain electrodes has been further defined in those claims. Hence, the claims 22, 29 and 37 further structurally define over Nagano and the Figure 9 embodiment is believed to be no longer applicable.

Serial No. **10/720,385**

Docket No. **K-0196A**

Amendment dated **DECEMBER 27, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of **June 29, 2004**

As shown in Figure 9 of Nagano, the first sustain electrode and the second sustain electrode are not spaced apart since electrode x' illustrates first and second electrodes which are contiguous. Further, none of the other embodiments of Nagano, i.e., Figures 1, 7 and 8, disclose or teach the specific percentages recited in independent claims 22, 29 and 37. Hence, withdrawal of this §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 45-57, 50-56, 59-65 and 68-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 45, 54 and 65 have been further amended to structurally distinguish over the Figure 9 embodiment of Nagano. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Nagano fails to disclose or teach that a lateral distance of 1260μm corresponds to a pixel pitch, as discussed during the interview. During the interview, U.S. Patent No. 6,603,266 was provided. However, this reference only discloses that the pixel pitch is approximately 1/4 of the lateral distance. This reference does not support the Patent Office conclusion that the lateral distance corresponds to pixel pitch. In fact, if the 1/4 lateral distance of 420 micron pitch is applied to Nagano, the width of the gap is easily greater than 50% of the pixel pitch. Further, it is unclear as to whether the 1/4 relationship to the lateral distance is always true. The Patent Office conclusion that the lateral distance corresponds to the pixel pitch is erroneous.

Serial No. **10/720,385**

Docket No. **K-0196A**

Amendment dated **DECEMBER 27, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of **June 29, 2004**

Nagano alone or in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,603,266 fails to disclose or teach the features recited in independent claims 45, 54, and 65. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Hence, withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25, 32, 40, 48, 57 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano in view of Sano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,264). Further, claims 26, 33, 41, 49, 58 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nagano in view of Sano et al., and further in view of Katayama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,614). Both rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sano et al. is relied upon to teach the barrier ribs, and Katayama et al. is relied upon to teach the thickness of the barrier ribs. However, it is respectfully submitted that both references fail to disclose or teach the structural features and/or percentages recited in independent claims 22, 29, 37, 45, 54 and 65 and the proposed combination of those references with the primary references cannot render the invention obvious. Hence, withdrawal of both Section 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

New claims 73-94 are added. These claims depend from the independent claims to further define the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact

Serial No. **10/720,385**

Docket No. **K-0196A**

Amendment dated **DECEMBER 27, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of **June 29, 2004**

the undersigned attorney, **Daniel Y.J. Kim**, at the telephone number listed below. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186



P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

703 766-3701 DYK/dak/cah

Date: December 29, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\\\fk4\\Documents\\2016\\2016-633\\49395.doc